

E 445
.M67 G5



Slavery in the United States ----- Emancipation in Missouri.

S P E E C H

OF

SAMUEL T. GLOVER,

AT THE

RATIFICATION MEETING IN ST. LOUIS,

HELD AT THE

COURT HOUSE, JULY 22, 1863.

217
861



ST. LOUIS:

DAILY UNION STEAM PRINTING HOUSE.

CORNER OF THIRD AND LOCUST STREETS.

1863.

Exp.

Ms. A. 9. 2. 5. 1. 12

Slavery in the United States—Emancipation in Missouri.

S P E E C H

OF

SAMUEL T. GLOVER,

AT THE

Ratification Meeting Held at the Court House, in St. Louis, July 22d, 1863.

MY FRIENDS: I shall direct your attention to-night to some important events in our political history; and to several striking aspects which that history has developed. I shall, if I can, show you the condition of our unhappy country, and declare my convictions of the duty of the people. The British colonies of North America proclaimed themselves independent of the mother country, July 4th, 1776. The war which had been in progress prior to that event was substantially ended in 1781. January, 1783, peace was made. Since then the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA have held legal *status* among the nations of the earth. A short period, my friends, for the life of a nation: if it so be that the nation is now to close its bright career and die. The form of the Government was not only peculiar, but it was a new, untried experiment. One of its most interesting features was this: that the nation had but a few powers accorded to it; the States retaining all the residue of governmental authority. Domestic systems and policies were placed under State jurisdiction. National and foreign administration were confided to the Union. It was a noble system, deemed by many (of whom I am one) a form of government essential to the liberties of every people extending over a large country. This most curious and till then, perhaps, unknown feature of social order, was developed in the practice of the new government: that one State might adopt and

inculcate a policy directly opposed to the policy of another State; and even to the policy of the nation. Our first parents, while inhabiting the garden of Eden, were not more free in many respects to choose the good and evil which were placed before them than were those local jurisdictions to lay out for themselves the foundations of their social domestic economy. Such were and have been admitted to be the powers of the National and such the powers of the State Governments. The National Government never interfered with this arrangement. The States themselves have claimed and exercised all the powers which have been acknowledged to belong to them. The institutions which they have seen fit to adopt are their own. The benefits which they have derived from these institutions are the just rewards of their wisdom and forecast. The injuries, if any, the consequence of their own follies.

It is now some eighty years since the people of these States, under a Government so constituted, enjoyed the right to administer their own affairs. The period that has elapsed embraces four generations of men; an ample time for the development of principles and some satisfactory observation of their influence on Government and social relations. Let us hope that the lights of these eighty years, which have been steadily beaming on the progress of our country, have not shone in vain. The close of the period finds us engaged in civil war; the contest the most stupendous which the world has seen; no such stakes have hitherto been played for by armed combatants; no such armies, it is believed, either in ancient or modern times, have trod the earth. This controversy is not of to-day. Its causes are to be found in the far past. An eloquent Frenchman has remarked, that by a striking coincidence in 1620 the Mayflower landed on Plymouth Rock a handful of *white* men. That in the same year another ship, supposed to be Dutch, passed up James river and put on shore a small cargo of *black* men; and thence deduces the source of all our troubles. My friends, there was another controversy some hundred and twenty-eight years ago, which, perhaps, typified and foreshadowed the pending struggle. That was not a question of arms, but a peaceful contest, where judges presided and lawyers appeared and witnesses testified. I refer to the dispute between proprietors of lands claiming under William Penn, the Quaker father and founder of Pennsylvania, and Sir Cecil Calvert, (Lord Baltimore) who sustained the same relation to Maryland, touching the line between these provinces of the British Crown. The calls of the respective grants were vague, and the questions of interference difficult. In 1735 a suit was brought in the English Chancery to adjust the boundary. In 1763 our countryman, the ingenious and learned David Rittenhouse, was called upon to run the line. No adjustment was had till 1769, when the astronomers, Mason and Dixon, were sent over from England under instructions to locate the boundary by astronomic determination. In that morning hour of Young America, when the earth was almost as it came from the Creator's touch; when a virgin soil and a blooming wilderness stretched away from the head of the Chesapeake Bay "to Susquehanna's outmost springs;" when all was so rich and beautiful; it was necessary to cut into the land, and to mark upon its surface and upon its trees and rocks the permanent and visible signs by which it was divided between Penn and Baltimore. It was necessary then to provide a means whereby the respective proprietors could tell which was which, and where Pennsylvania ended and Maryland began. But, my friends, all this was in 1735, more than a century ago. The aspects of the country are not now what they were then.

Since Mason and Dixon went back to London to file their report of survey in the Court of Chancery, Pennsylvania and Maryland have followed the lines of separate policies: Pennsylvania has set up her "institutions," and Maryland hers. In 1863 there is no difficulty in finding the line between them. The traveler who first set foot on this continent yesterday detects it without the slightest effort. He needs no compass. It is not necessary to look at the stars. He has only to turn his eyes upon the earth; and he may follow it with almost as much certainty as he can the Buffalo and Albany Canal. A worn out and barren soil, a stunted agricultural vegetation, fields abandoned by the husbandman, dilapidated inclosures, inferior architectural structures, and an almost universal face of decay, tell him that the Southern side of that line has been more than a century under the watchful care of the guardian genius of Maryland. The line which was run and marked by Mason and Dixon, for the mere purpose of limiting the proprietors of Maryland and Pennsylvania, was destined to acquire, in the course of years, a consequence and importance of which they little dreamed. They intended it to limit adjoining proprietors. It has been made the dividing line of social and economical systems. They made it to separate two young and feeble colonies of the mother country, then having no history or political importance. It has been seized upon to separate many States, to divide the American nation, to destroy its glorious Union, and to limit on the North a new empire, to be erected within the Southern portion of the Republic. That which was once a mere parallel of latitude has been diverted north from the southwest course of Pennsylvania to the Ohio river; thence down the Ohio, with its meanders to the Mississippi river; thence up the Mississippi, dividing Missouri from Illinois, and thence in a course, to surround the States of Missouri, Arkansas and Texas, to the Rio Grande del Norte, which it follows to the sea. I will not delay you with the history of this boundary, the contests it has created, the bitterness it has engendered. Suffice it that for forty years Mason and Dixon's line, straight, or crooked, has been the watchword of politicians, moralists, religionists. The people have been taught to call a portion of the national domain, on one side, "the North," on the other, "the South." We have been accustomed to hear much of Northern and Southern men, and Northern and Southern principles. Our schools, in which have been trained the rising minds and passions of the nation, are branded with this distinction. Even our churches are Northern and Southern churches, as if the altars of our religion had been devoted to Northern and Southern Gods. The future historian, whose duty it shall be to reflect the aspects of this great drama, will remark that the tortuosity of the line is but the representation of the ebb and flow of popular passion—of the triumphs and defeats of parties during the whole period of our national existence. As more immediately touching the recent outbreak, it will be his duty to record, that though this line range through ten degrees of latitude, and bears to almost every point of the compass, and passes through several varieties of climate and soil, and classes of population, yet that everywhere this line has been the line of the rebellion. That, in the language of the day, Missouri is a Southern State, and Illinois, Indiana and Ohio are Northern States; that while the latter maintained their allegiance and preserved the peace, people of Missouri—away here in the cold North, including the larger number of the officers of the State—raised the standard of revolt, and levied war upon the nation, professedly to secure their "Southern rights." Surely this is a curious aspect of the controversy—that Missouri,

repudiating her neighborhood, and even her climate, should seek for interests not identified with Iowa nor Illinois: but supposed interests which the revolvers deemed themselves to possess in common with South Carolina and Georgia.

My friends, there is another aspect of the case on which I would fix your attention. It is a fact, attested by eighty years of history, that in general, mankind do not like to live within that charmed circle bounded by the straight and crooked Mason and Dixon's line. I do not deem it material now to inquire the cause. I assert the fact, and leave it for your own solution: that mankind in general shun the better institutions and purer social systems that are claimed to exist in that area. The Southern soil is richer, but, men in general, prefer the poorer lands of the North. The area contained within the boundary is greater, but the larger area at the end of eighty years has less voluntary population by one-half. The climate on the south of the line is more genial, but in the general men prefer the more inhospitable Northern air. Here is a problem for naturalists and socialists alike. Why should people, being free to choose their own abodes, turn away in disgust from this lovely country? How are we to account for such a difference as eight and eighteen millions? In the South we know there is an involuntary population—people who have been carried there and held there against their will. The presence of these in no manner redeems the hard features of this aspect. If you add the whole colored population, bond and free, the difference will be twelve to eighteen millions. It is remarkable that such a fact should exist of a country whose soil, climate and other natural advantages are so superior. It is wonderful that while the institutions of a country are so much lauded, so many of the people who are born under them should hasten to get away; and that of all those who come from abroad to make their homes among us, so few comparatively, should be willing to cast their lot on the sunny side of Mason and Dixon's line. The fact, however, is undeniable. It stands out on the surface of the Southern system, in bold and terrible relief. The deep channel of the Mississippi, indenting its way to the Gulf; the wild sweep of the Alleghany range lifting its crest into the clouds, are objects not more distinctly or permanently marked upon the earth than is this feature upon the sociality of the South. It is your duty and the duty of all men to reach the cause of this dreadful fact. Is it supposed some deadly poison mingles with Southern fountains, which men would avoid? No. Do they deem there is there some Upas tree, whose malarium tints the air, and whose taste is mortal? Not at all. Why is it that millions and millions of our race should be repelled from the fairest portion of this continent? My friends, the earthquake, whose yawning chasm should engulf the British islands in an hour, would annihilate a quantum of intellectual power, and moral and social influence, and industrial energies and physical resources, and national and individual wealth, whose loss would be felt upon the earth to the latest syllable of recorded time.

But what ought to be said of the partial annihilation of another country more than ten times the magnitude of the British isles, by inclosing it in a sort of moral Chinese wall, that in the lapse of only eighty years has excluded from happy homes not less than ten millions of our race? Is this the working of a wise or prudent plan of social or political economy? Is it in accordance with God's providence that the manifold bounties of nature in all this vast region should be shut out in this way from so large a number of his dependent creatures?

My friends, I shall pass rapidly over the next important development of this

history. The National Government, in the course of its administration, raises a revenue from several sources, and this revenue is distributed for the common benefit. Never has that portion of the national domain, lying south of the line, yielded an income equal to necessary expenditures within its limits—whether it has been the national defenses, the support of the army or navy, the Post Office Department, or the purposes of commerce, with its coast surveys—its custom-houses, lighthouses, buoys and dredge boats—the south has been a mendicant on the treasury of the nation, yielding less than it needed—receiving more than it ever returned. I make no comment on these facts. The national records attest their truth. I throw them before you and leave them. Time is the wisest of counselors; and these are his advices.

Allow me to mention another of these political aspects. It is known to the whole world—has never been disputed, and excites a painful attention. It is this: that there so little is done for the intellectual culture of the inhabitants. Colleges exist—many of them are well endowed. The rich enjoy the advantages of education; in general, the poor do not. Of these it may be said emphatically, as has been said of the dead in an English grave-yard:

“But knowledge to their eyes her ample page;
Rich with the spoils of time did ne’er unroll;
Chill penury repressed their noble rage,
And froze the genial current of the soul.”

No facilities for general dissemination of knowledge exist at the South. As regards the involuntary population, the laws require them to remain in eternal ignorance. A domestic policy long established, shuts out every ray of science from their benighted understandings; closes their eyes against ever beholding the revealed will of God which is intended to guide to a better world. As to the voluntary population, it is fair to state their education would be preferred. But it cannot be. The case is one where good intentions go for nothing. The white population is too sparse. And, in general, the cause of common schools is hopeless at the South. In 1850 there were in the North 14,883 public libraries; in the South only 713. In the North 39,200 primary schools; in the South only 7,201. In the North were receiving instruction in primary schools 1,645,128 pupils; in the South only 200,605. Now you know my friends, how common it has been here to speak of the beneficence of Southern institutions. But what are these institutions of which we speak? Is it possible that we have dignified slavery with the title “our institutions?” Have we ceased to think of trial by jury, of popular suffrage, of freedom of speech and the press, of *habeas corpus* and frequent Legislatures; and have we failed to consider the general enlightenment of the people as a necessary foundation and support to these, and all these, and of public virtue? There is no misfortune so calamitous to a State as popular ignorance. There is no predicament so pitiable as that which a people are hurried to destruction by guilty leaders, while all unconscious of the fact. Where general ignorance prevails, there prevails stolid immobility, or faction moved by sudden impulses, lashed, it may be, into wild, ungovernable fury. Without knowledge there is no improvement, and without improvement there is no hope. A State may successfully encounter war, pestilence, or famine; or, all together. For these there are remedies in the course of nature. If war comes he shakes as with a giant’s tread the

pillars and foundations of the State. He buffets rudely our social and civil relations and rights. He passes by our homes and they are filled with mourning. He passes over our fields and they are blasted and blackened by his fiery bolts. Famine may slay his thousands, and pestilence his tens of thousands. But I have said these are transient evils. Victory conquers or exhaustion mitigates the miseries of war. At length the frightful spectre departs, and beautiful and gentle peace resumes her sway. The plague that walketh in darkness, that horrifies the midday as well as the midnight hour, vanishes on the breath of morning. The mayflower expands her fair coronal above the bleak skeleton; and from fields ensanguined with heroic blood, the rank harvest springs forth to bless the land with plenty.

The moral desolation of the soul knows neither spring time nor autumn; where nothing is planted, nothing is gathered. Shut out the lights of knowledge from the human mind, and there is no compensation in the course of nature; but all is dark and despairing, and of downward tendency. By this process you may rear and maintain the massive proportions of Russian and Turkish despotism, but never — never — a free republic.

You are, perhaps, prepared to hear that these social aspects have found their counterparts in the political sentiments of the South; that, in general, the broad charter of human rights is there repudiated; that there the great plea of Jefferson for humanity — “that all men are created equal,” endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,” is generally rejected. That in lieu thereof there has been proclaimed another doctrine, which is that there is no standard of human rights; no such thing as liberty founded on principles of equality and justice; that the law of the strongest is the true social law; that he who has the power to enslave his fellow man, has the right to do it; that weak men and weak nations are naturally, and, therefore, morally, the fair game of strong men and strong nations. You must not object that this is the spirit exactly which governs the beasts of the field. That the bull, the bear, and the tiger, long since established the same system. It might be regarded as disrespectful to gentlemen who have not claimed to be a tribe of New Zealanders, but a school of philosophers, who write essays and books, and who have invoked all the instincts of avarice and power, suborned even the ministrations of religion to maintain their policy of absolutism over the bodies and minds of men. It is within the memory of young persons when these unfeeling dogmas were applied by the slavery perpetuationists to the black race alone. But error, like truth, is progressive, and they are now made to embrace all mankind. They admit the right of no human being to more of immunity than can be won by strategy, or seized and held by force. Mr. Calhoun undertook, about the year 1848, to prepare a disquisition on Government, embodying the new philosophy of Southern type. It was marked by all the subtleness and daring of its author. It was no covert attack on popular liberty, but a bold, defiant assault upon all free institutions known in the world. I have time only to state its fundamental points: (1.) That numerical majorities should not control, for they respect neither reason, truth, or justice. (2.) It is better to trust the minority. (3.) That each different interest in society should have its separate Representative in the Legislature, and hold a vote on its action. (4.) The prevalent opinion that “all men are created equal,” is false. (5.) That among the various forms of Government a mon-

archy is most susceptible of improvement; for it is a kindly, parental government. (6.) That a hereditary nobility tends to increase protection and security to all the people. No where in the disquisition on Government does this restless leader of the Southern movement expressly denounce popular government; no where does he ask the Southrons to inaugurate an aristocracy and enthrone a king. But it is evident that such was the aim of the book. My friends, the doctrines of this work are the underlying stratum of Southern society. If the revolutionary movement shall succeed, the coming empire of the cotton Caliphs will take its form and pressure from them; and the future sultans of New Orleans and Mobile and Charleston will quote them with all the reverence with which Moslem ever quoted the Koran. It is the curious and interesting inquiry of the naturalist to discover what are the causes which, working slowly but certainly in the recesses of the earth, have finally resulted in some striking phenomenon of nature. The geologist presumes to tell us, in this way, how lakes and rivers are formed; how table lands are heaved up from the bottom of the ocean; and how, after long cycles of time, they sink down again into its bosom. The moralist has a not dissimilar task to trace the causes which have quietly undermined the convictions of a free people, and reversed all the motives and principles of their social order, which, in a period of less than fifty years, have moved them to demolish their young liberties, and to build up instead, aristocratic and monarchic institutions. What, I ask, has been the cause of this most wonderful social and political phenomenon? What has expelled and repelled population from this delightful country? What has repressed therein the diffusion of knowledge? What has impoverished its soil and enervated its industry? Why have the Southern people generally become the inveterate enemies of free government? And how does it happen that such opinions generally prevail among a people to whom the "fierce democracy" of Jefferson was so lately an inspired oracle? The answer to these questions may possibly be found in the error that was committed in 1789. That error, I humbly submit, was the acquiescence then yielded to slavery—the endeavor to build and maintain freedom on such a foundation. The conventional forms of government in those States which saw fit to retain the peculiar institution were fair. They embodied the principles of civil liberty and failed only in the application of these principles. It was especially provided in several of the constitutions of these States that no titles of nobility should exist; while, in fact a worse, evil than any titled nobility was recognized and protected by their laws. Any citizen might lawfully own a thousand or ten thousand of his fellow men, and control their conduct as no Lord, Marquis, Duke or Earl had ever thought of doing. There was a great statute of England, known as the *habeas corpus act*. The principles of this enactment were identified with the struggles for liberty in that country for two centuries. It had come down to the men of 1789, associated with the sufferings and triumphs, and fame of patriot martyrs. The purpose of the statute was to secure to every person restrained of his liberty a speedy hearing, and thus prevent protracted and unjust imprisonment. Every lawyer knows what Blackstone has said of this statute:

"That to bereave a man of life, or by violence to confiscate his estate without accusation, would be so gross and notorious an act of despotism as must at once convey the alarm of tyranny throughout the whole nation; but confinement of the person by secretly hurrying him to jail is a less public, less striking, and, therefore, more dangerous engine of arbitrary government."

For such reasons our ancestors revered the *habeas corpus* act. They incorporated it into the Federal Constitution, and almost all the Constitutions of the States. But while they did so, they knew that in nearly every one of these States there were men who were subject to the caprice of other men: whose liberties had long been extinguished; who had never been permitted to acquire the least property; who were denied the family relation, and whose persons were undergoing a perpetual imprisonment, without crime and without accusation.

It was almost universally conceded, in 1787, that slavery was an evil, and ought to pass away. But the "peculiar institution" "wished to be let alone." The slave owners were willing to abolish; but looked forward to a more propitious season. These professions were listened to; and slavery was not abolished. The benefit of the *habeas corpus* was secured to the white man; but denied to the African. It was a curious error. It was a singular conclusion that men, who could not be trusted to do justice to one of their own race, would voluntarily respect the rights of another and inferior people. The slaves were not only not emancipated, but their number was increased by importations from Africa. The growth of the "institution" constantly drove out free labor, and in doing so expelled the middle class of society, tending to leave none but the wealthy planter and the slave. The decrease of the middle class has always furnished the certain proof of the decay of liberty. Here, then, situated on our southern and south-eastern seaboard, was the vigorous germ of an aristocracy.

It is in vain to suppose that, under such circumstances, men will cherish the principles of freedom. Example is ever more potent than precept. The daily practice of slavery tends to destroy the sentiments of liberty. And thus it was that ARISTOCRACY rose, confronting and defying POPULAR GOVERNMENT.

It has been supposed that slavery transformed the South. That it assumed control of the social circle, and ruled it with an imperious sway. That it won the beholder with the splendors and fascinations of wealth, while it awed and repelled him by the presence of a caste whose outer courts he could never enter without subscribing to all its inexorable dogmas. That it grasped the ballot-box and dominated it with the same unswerving energy which had swayed the empire of Southern *ton* and fashion. That it elected Governors and Legislatures and Congresses, dictated to National Conventions, made and unmade Presidents and parties; ruled us at home, and threatened and defied the world. That albeit this interest represented a small minority of the American people, its influence impressed itself on our treaties with foreign nations, and in the year of our Lord, 1846, the nation undertook and carried on a great and expensive war: a war of conquest—a war of injustice—to gratify the behests of this caste. It has been asserted that from the close of the Mexican war the slave power was triumphant. That orators, statesmen, philosophers, poets, paid an humble homage at its footstool.

That, in 1860, a pro-slavery literature, a pro-slavery politics, and a pro-slavery religion had been fully installed. The result had been reached by the energy of a caste bound together by one interest, and impelled by one ambition, checked by no other class of the people, for in their section there was no other class of sufficient power; opposed by no other interest, for they suffered no other interest to exist there. The power of the caste, felt first in the far South, extended its influence toward the North, until the border slave States were deeply imbued with

its spirit. Amazed at their success and swollen with conceit and vanity, the planters were induced to regard themselves as the special bantlings of Heaven, called by Providence to govern the country. The consequence is, the civil war now raging. It has been justly denominated a pro-slavery war. It is impossible to magnify its wickedness. It is impossible to exaggerate the injury which it must inflict upon our people or upon the world.

My friends, let no one suppose that in gathering these proofs of the past, I lay to the account of all the Southern people the general conduct of their section. Far from it. Many of our purest patriots and ablest statesmen have been Southern men. Let no one suspect me of a spirit of malevolence toward slaveholders. I own none of that sympathy for the slave which exhausts itself in hatred of the master. The men who have struggled hardest and sacrificed most to resist pernicious tendencies and arbitrary resolutions of their section, have been Southern men. That slaveholders cannot be or are not as truly loyal as non-slaveholders, I know to be an atrocious calumny. If the Southern people are no better, they are no worse than others. Their errors have sprung not from any peculiarity of the people, but from the presence of an unfortunate institution, whose existence attaches upon the whole country, North and South. But we cannot if we would, shut out the light of experience. We cannot, we dare not ignore the causes of this war.

It is well to understand that the vital principle of the war is hostility to freedom. That it began in the interest of slavery and is prosecuted for the PERPETUATION OF SLAVERY; and that it is in the Providence of God, that no such question can ever find repose in compromises. If peace were declared to-day, and the limits set to a new empire, whose mission should be the perpetuation and extension of slavery, the contest would not be ended. The spirit of liberty, and the spirit of humanity would laugh to scorn your puny efforts to circumscribe their power. The principles of war would survive your treaties, and with them would survive all the strife and all the agony. If there was to-day situated on our southern coast an independent nation, embracing six millions of white men and four millions of slaves, and based upon the policy of perpetuation, the fabric would contain, within itself, the certain causes of its own destruction: opposition to slavery from within, and opposition to slavery from without, would shock the State with unrelenting assaults. In course of the next eighty years, even if the slave trade to Africa were not revived, the slaves would increase to more than sixty millions of souls! The perpetuationist will ask you, when you urge upon him the business of emancipation, what you propose to do with four millions of emancipated slaves. The inquiry is a serious one, and calls for the profoundest statesmanship of our times. All reflecting minds concede its magnitude. But there is another question, in comparison with which even this grave inquiry sinks into insignificance: what will you do with sixteen millions of slaves at the end of forty years? What will you do with sixty millions of slaves at the end of eighty years? As the slave population increases, the white population will decrease; and what is to be the fate of the white population of the South? Here is the question of questions which looms up, in a terrible future, and demands for the South a policy wisely adapted to that future. What is slavery to be to the South when the rebellion is suppressed? What is slavery to be to the South when it has

realized its dream of separation? Will it, can it, have peace? Never—never.

There is but one policy adapted to the subject—slavery must cease to exist. The miseries of the past proclaim it. The hopes of the future demand it. I concede the whole subject is full of difficulty. Everywhere the practical working of emancipation is involved in uncertainty, and embarrassed with complications. He who imagines that he can solve this great problem by one act; that he can explore its dim future, and grasp already its manifold relations and thick coming necessities, has not yet formed the slightest conception of the subject. But if there are great difficulties in adjusting emancipation—difficulties in forecasting its results and providing for its working—there are yet greater difficulties in the policy of perpetuation. This is certain; and Missouri has done wisely to assume all the responsibility of the emancipation policy. Missouri has achieved an honorable distinction in being the first to set the great and necessary example. By her noble ORDINANCE she has placed slavery in a course of gradual and rapid extinction. Slavery has existed in North America for two hundred and forty-three years—on the soil of Missouri for more than a century—and under American governments, State and Territory, nearly sixty years. By the recent action of your Convention she rids herself of the institution forever in seven years! Would to God that ORDINANCE had reached every slave on this continent. But it seems we are not here, my friends, to accept this great organic law, not here to offer thanks to God for so great a boon; but to defend it against violent and bitter assaults. Nothing is so good as to escape opposition. The Savior of men was crucified by those whom he came to save. Our charcoal friends object to this ordinance because it is *gradual* and not *immediate*. And yet it is only about four months ago that the whole Charcoal party were the earnest, united advocates of *gradual* emancipation! In March last they DEMANDED the adoption of this system. Now that their opinion has been followed, they denounce their *own scheme*. What reason can they assign for this? We know that St. Paul was converted by a divine manifestation—a great and sudden light that burst upon him from heaven. I have heard of no miracle which happened to the *Charcoals*, but still they are all converted in this brief period to oppose so fiercely their own doctrine! How, or when they were converted, is for them to show. They object to 1870 as the time when slavery shall cease. Yet they were exceedingly anxious for 1866 and the apprenticeship. A part of them were for 1868. But when, by the resolution of conflicting opinions, 1870 was fixed upon, and nothing better could be had from the Convention, the *Charcoals* pronounced it an outrage. If I am not misinformed, the Hon. Mr. Drake has declared that it is a “damnable outrage,” which is as strong language as a good Presbyterian ought to employ. Had not Mr. Drake been a devout Christian, there is no telling what, under the pressure of worldly wrath and vanity, he might have said against this MAGNA CHARTER of liberty. The *Charcoals* now propose to commence a ten years’ agitation to secure, forsooth, 1866! But the Convention released the slaves from taxes; and this is a loss the *Charcoals* can never endure. The unfortunate victim who had a roseleaf doubled under him, ergo—could not sleep, knew no affliction compared to what the *Charcoals* suffer on account of these taxes. My friends, how much taxes would have been saved to the State if their last plan of immediate emancipation had prevailed? How much had they succeeded in getting 1866 or 1868? Suppose the

average life of an able bodied slave is forty years, value \$400, four years is the tenth of the life and \$40 the tenth of the value. You see what is the sum to be taxed and how utterly unworthy this clamor is. But our Charcoals admit they ought to compensate, if possible, for slaves emancipated—that justice demanded it. They have never done it. And until they do, they are honestly estopped to object to this release of taxes. They admit they ought to provide for the young, the old, the sick, the lame, the idiotic, and the blind. They have never done it; and until they do, humanity and decency forbid this ungenerous brawling. It is next asserted that an ORDINANCE of gradual emancipation is a mere “cheat” and “swindle,” that it sets no slave free, and is a measure in the interest of slavery! It is very likely that the man who has been sentenced by Judge Clover to be hung on Friday, regards that judgement as one purposely intended to save him from the gallows! Most certainly it looks that way, and most certainly his honor is party to the fraud! The only wonder is the perpetuationists all voted against it. They thought it might possibly emancipate their slaves, but this “swindle,” as it is called, has a history, and I beg a moment’s time to present it. In January or February, 1862, the President held a consultation of his Cabinet upon the subject. The result was, Mr. Lincoln recommended “gradual emancipation” to Congress. So the President and the Cabinet were the first *swindlers*. Mr. Drake, whose nice preceptions of virtue, and exquisite moral taste have been so rudely shocked by an ORDINANCE of gradual emancipation, was perhaps innocent of this guilt. I do not know that prior to 1862 he had ever been known to utter an anti-slavery sentiment. It is well known that before that time slavery had no humbler or fonder worshiper than he. April 10, 1862, the Congress not only endorsed the so-called “swindle,” but offered to compensate any State whose people should adopt it. Oh, the abominable knaves! May 18, 1862, Mr. Lincoln again recommended it by proclamation. Dishonest man! June 15, 1862, the Charcoals met in Jefferson City, and adopted the following resolution, among others:

“*Resolved*, That we are in favor of initiating forthwith a system of emancipation for the State of Missouri, *gradual in its character*, and the operation of which shall be so adjusted as not to work injury to the pecuniary interest of any loyal citizen, *whose vested property rights may be involved, and not to disturb by any violent disruption, present social relations in our community.*”

Noble patriots! September 22, 1862, Mr. Lincoln again recommended the same scheme by proclamation. Oh, the dishonest cheat! December, 1862, the President, once more, in his Message to Congress, pressed upon the country the subject of emancipation, urging compensation, whether the work should be gradual or immediate, and naming the year 1900 as the limit for its accomplishment, Oh, the vile old Copperhead! In March, 1863, our Charcoal friends again met in consultation. They abandoned all their former predilections for *immediatism*! They prepared and signed solemnly a written pledge to the country in favor of “*gradual emancipation!!*” a judicious plan of gradual emancipation as the best thing for Missouri!!! Able statesmen, exalted patriots. In June, 1863, the Convention met, the Governor recommended, and the Convention passed an ORDINANCE of emancipation, “gradual emancipation.” Oh, the despicable swindlers—the “damnable” cheats—the vile Copperheads! who does not perceive that a fraud was intended? That the ORDINANCE will never take effect, and has been made by

and for the benefit of slavery ; is intended to be repealed when the rebels come home from the war ? It is true that not one of these rebels can legally vote when he comes home, nevertheless, they can and will repeal the ORDINANCE ! My friends, if this be a swindle, the swindlers are very numerous, and the honest men are very few. If it be a swindle, it was such as removed slavery from Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Connecticut. My friends, it is idle, worse than idle, to complain of the details of a great measure like this, when the vital question of the public necessity is fully met. Whether the end of slavery shall come in 1866, or 1868, or 1870, is not the vital matter. That slavery shall be put in gradual course of extinction, that ere long it shall cease, and cease forever, is the vital matter. It is not certain that the details of this great measure were exactly acceptable to any one. To Mr. Broadhead, more than any of the eminent advocates of Emancipation, is the State indebted for the particular shape of the ORDINANCE. Yet I am confident it was not exactly what he desired. No man can go into a deliberative body and procure, in all particulars, his own essential views, No sensible man expects it. A general result approaching nearly to his wishes, is satisfactory. Such a result is attained by THE GREAT ORDINANCE. By its moral, no less than its legal power, slavery is destroyed in Missouri. From the moment of its enactment the prestige of the peculiar institution was gone. It had no political power ; no social influence, and no future. From that moment it was to wane, and fall rapidly away. Our Charcoals may use their utmost power to prove that the ORDINANCE is to be repealed and slavery maintained in Missouri. No one will swallow the monstrous absurdity. Outside of Missouri the whole anti-slavery world, with a few exceptions, hail the action of the Convention with acclamation of delight.

They regard it now as posterity will regard it — as the salvation of Missouri. That the Convention had no power to pass this Ordinance, has never been asserted by the Charcoals with half the vehemence that they have proclaimed the contrary. The Convention wisely judged that their loyal constituents would promptly ratify their work. They have done so. No great political reform was ever more cordially or more gratefully embraced by any people than this Ordinance has been by the people of Missouri. What has just transpired, my friends, in Missouri, is soon to be re-enacted in Kentucky, Tennessee, Maryland and Delaware. These States will follow Missouri in the work of emancipation. The march of our armies, the acts of confiscation, the President's proclamation, and other measures of military necessity wisely adopted by him to weaken the power of the rebellion, will destroy slavery in all the residue of the national domain. These four millions of people are to pass from their state of servitude to that of freedom. Let us begin to regard this as the inevitable *denouement* of the mighty drama, whose scenes are sweeping rapidly before us. I see nothing but a miraculous interposition which can prevent the result, and I look for no miracle in behalf of slavery. It is not the course of Providence. The political world will favor that issue. And, while thousands will reach forth the hand to precipitate, none will shed a tear over the fall of the institution.

It is from this stand-point, my friends, that we are to look out upon the troubled sea and shape our course. The current of events is raising great questions. Missouri, by her late ORDINANCE, is soon to have a large free negro popu-

lation of her own. In the mean time free negroes in great numbers have been pouring into our State from Arkansas, Mississippi and Tennessee. What just and humane provisions shall be made for these people? Shall the colored population have their permanent home among us? Shall we have some hundreds of thousands more of them here? And what shall be the status of the negro in relation to the white man and his government? A portion of the immediate emancipation party have declared their policy to be that the freed negro shall remain on our soil, shall be granted full rights of citizenship, participating in all the functions of government and perfect social equality, amalgamating with the dominant race by means of the marriage tie. I am free to say, that in my judgment, this is not the interest of either of the races. That wisdom points to their separation. That Missouri should resist the influx of a negro population. That her own free colored people should be colonized. That the whole colored population of the nation should have some country of their own. I do not say in South America, nor in Central America, nor in Mexico. I do not say that that country must be beyond the limits of the national domain. If one place is not practicable, another may be found that is. The American nation is justly chargeable, in the sight of God, with the care of this unfortunate people.

My friends, I have already detained you too long. But you must allow me to say, that your first, your last, your greatest duty is to suppress the rebellion. More than ever, at this moment, does the Government need the earnest and active sympathy and co-operation of loyal men. Rally to the support of the administration and by whatever means you can command, by material or moral aid, by words of confidence and words of encouragement, uphold, support, and cheer the administration in its arduous labors. If for a moment you have lost confidence in its wisdom and energy, remember that you could not fully appreciate the difficulties that surrounded it, and, in such case you should assume that Government was doing its whole duty. You should observe that when Mr. Lincoln came to his great office, no man was ever confronted with more appalling difficulties—a gigantic rebellion was developed, its party thoroughly organized, trained, many of our most important forts and garrisons in the hands of conspirators, and all their preparations, financial and military, complete. On the other hand, the National Administration was perfectly helpless, the National resources in every department perfectly prostrate, the treasury robbed, the armories and arsenals turned over to the enemy, the army and navy corrupted, and all the avenues of public business, and official intelligence filled with traitors and spies who betrayed and thwarted the plans of Government. From such low estate the administration of ABRAHAM LINCOLN commenced its career. Who can say that it has not been eminently successful? Every hour has seen the Government, in his hands, developing more and more a majestic power. The army, the navy, the treasury, the improved condition of industry and commerce, the personal comfort of the citizen, the success of our arms, the national character abroad, bear manifold testimony to the eminent patriotism and statesmanship of the President. By the unremitting industry and care, and the profound sagacity of the Administration, the rebellion is pressed to the wall, and if the people will only do their duty now, in sustaining the Government, in bringing into the field, promptly, the conscripts called for, a certain and bloodless and final triumph is near at hand.

My friends, I have told you your greatest duty is to suppress the rebellion. But why suppress the rebellion? To support your Constitution—to maintain your free form of government—to preserve liberty. It is an incident to civil war to breed a revolutionary spirit—an impatience of restraint—a disregard for those regular proceedings and settled forms of justice which is subversive of a government of laws. I need not say to you that such a spirit is already rife in the land, and that good citizens are called upon everywhere to rise in their might and rebuke this fatal distemper of the times. You have seen its ill-boding tendency on the floor of the United States Senate and in the Representative Hall. But nowhere has it manifested itself more fiercely than on the soil of your own State, where a party, calling themselves Radicals, have inculcated, directly and indirectly, lawless and revolutionary doctrines. Disapproving the State Administration, they have denied its authority under the Constitution and laws, and counseled resistance to its acts. Opposed to slavery, they cannot moderate their views to principles of government—cannot wait for the repeal of slave laws, statutory or constitutional; but demand that these laws shall be disregarded and that civil process, emanating from our courts for the execution of these laws, shall be trampled under foot. Emancipationists, they resort to violence, appealing to force and to the power of the mob and the bayonet to dissolve the relation of master and slave, forgetting that the peace of society is all-important, and that “all things should be done decently and in order.” Aspirants to office, they advise the holding of illegal elections in opposition to the plain law, and when such an election is thrown out, they complain of oppression and incite violence. When they have broken the laws, they oppose the sitting of the court and burn the Judge in effigy. Sworn to support, maintain and defend the Constitution, they do not hesitate to declare that the Constitution has ceased to have any force, whenever its provisions stand in their way. My friends, these alarming symptoms of a diseased state of the popular mind call for the most efficient remedies, and unless they are controlled by such means as the people alone can bring to bear, the most deplorable consequences must ensue.

The fact is that the citizen of the United States has enjoyed liberty so long—has been so free from oppression as scarcely to know what it is. For fifty years he has never known how to appreciate his country, until he had turned his back upon her. It was when he crossed the Atlantic and stood upon the soil of France, where absolutism for centuries had so impressed itself upon the external forms of men that even now a Frenchman continues to whisper his thoughts, or shrug his shoulders in silence, that he comprehends in some good degree the value of free institutions. It was when he attempted to leave France, passing into some other portion of the continent, and was met by a system of espionage and extortions so annoying as to remind him sensibly of that unlimited commerce of persons and things, which was not the least of the glories of his native land. Did he find his way to Austria, where government kindly informs the people what political or religious books they may read? or to Russia, where justice is sold by men in arms, and universal venality prevails? A lesson of civil and religious liberty, never learned at home, was impressed upon his inmost soul. If, perchance, he turned his wandering steps towards Italy or Greece, it was only to observe how few of the bounties of nature were there permitted to relieve the wants of man.

It was only to exclaim with the bard :

“ And yet how lovely in thine age of woe,
Land of lost gods and godlike men art thou,
Thy vales of evergreen — thy hills of snow,
Proclaim thee nature's varied favorite now.
* * * * *
“ Thy fanes — thy temples to thy surface bow.”
* * * * *

If in England he found a people comparatively free, but groaning beneath the weight of overwhelming taxation. In the Southern portion of this continent he beheld a land rife with the most interesting spectacles of nature. Vast plains rich with agricultural and mineral resources, stretched out in the distance, herds of wild cattle grazed and roamed in countless numbers, gigantic forest trees with gigantic flowers, delighted the vision and filled the air with odors. There flowed the mightiest rivers of the earth; there rose mountain ranges unsurpassed in beauty and sublimity, and often as he gazed upon this wild scenery, that majestic bird, the condor of the rock rushed by on wing of thunder, and cleft the rising storm and climbed the clouds. The rushing stream, the fast careering bird, were fitting emblems of liberty, but of a liberty unfortunately now, only symbolized by them.

South America and Mexico once enjoyed free governments. More than a score of republics dwelt within their borders. They have all perished. I need not remind you how they perished. But the story is one of civil war. The sword was drawn first upon the enemies of liberty. Amid the rage of angry passions and the clash of arms her friends united with her foes on trampling in her sacred charters. Revolution succeeded revolution; each mad wave effacing the traces of its predecessor, until, at last, force and fraud supplanted the reign of law, and he who had least property was safest from harpies who preyed without mercy on the vitals of society. On returning to his native land, such a traveler had no difficulty, in comprehending what is liberty, and what is that he calls his country. It is something which he did not find in Russia, nor in South America. And now, my friends, what is that thing? If it is not the soil beneath our feet, nor the sky above us; if it is not air nor sun, nor natural scenery, where shall we find it? Undoubtedly in your form of government — in your Constitution. There your rights are secured. There your liberties are deposited. If you preserve constitutional governments, you preserve liberty. Abandon this and you have abandoned the life boat which would outride the storm. My friends, do you remember that when traitors conspired to overthrow your Government, they first declared themselves free from the obligations of the Constitution? And do you know that when Government would bind to it in most solemn form the allegiance of the citizen it demands, only that the citizen shall swear that “ *he will support and defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic.*” And why has it been made a perjury to violate this oath? And why is the offenders on conviction adjudged infamous and incarcerated in the penitentiary? Was it because the Constitution is a lifeless thing of no moment? Two classes of persons during these troubles have repudiated constitutional obligations. Secessionists, with arms in their hands, have made open war upon them. Other secessionists not taking arms, but working insidiously in behalf of treason, have assaulted them with false friendship and misrepresentation. These profess unqualified devotion to

the Constitution, because, as they see fit to represent it, it contains little that is good and almost everything that is evil. To our jaundiced eyes the Constitution is the very guardian of treason and foster spirit of rebellion. It forbids us to enlist volunteers, or levy conscripts; it allows no sufficient army or navy; it justifies every species of libel, sanctions mutiny and desertion, and makes loyalty a crime. Thus the mortal enemies of the Government falsely traduce its great organic law that they may destroy it.

There is another class of enemies to the Constitution. These agree with the Secessionists in all they say of its inefficiency, and demand that *revolutionary power shall be substituted for it*. They say that it lacks the vigor necessary to the times. That it may answer very well for peace, but is unfitted for war. And their notion is that the President is the head, not of a lawful government, but of a great revolutionary party, such as Napoleon and Cromwell led to the construction of "new models" of government. These persons profess to be superlatively loyal. And, doubtless, many of them think they are. But, my friends, loyal to what? Not to the Constitution, for that, they declare, has ceased to bind them; not to the Government, because independent of the Constitution there is no Government. Loyal to certain leaders, in whom they confide. Loyal, perhaps, to a party, or certain supposed purposes of a party, which for the present they trust and follow. Loyal to something they know not; the plan, the conceit, the dream of the revolutionist. My friends, you surely know that this is anarchy — wild, thoughtless, desperate anarchy. That nothing good can come of it; and if such opinions are to prevail extensively there will be no security for property, liberty or life. Let me conjure you to frown upon these unhallowed teachings, and scout from amongst you all who have the temerity to utter them. Appeal to your fellow-citizens to regard all such persons, whatever may be their intentions, as your and their enemies, and the enemies of your country. Rally to the support of the Constitution, and demand that the laws shall be executed, for in nothing else can you depend for peace and safety.

And now, my friends, allow me to assure you that despite the misrepresentations of friends or foes, the constitutional Government under which you have lived so long and so happily, is equal to all emergencies. Its power has never been found wanting yet; save when the people failed to use it — either "to execute the laws," "suppress insurrection," or "repel invasion." Only let the people do what the Constitution enjoins, and all will be well. When the people violated their Constitution, war and misery ensued. The moment they shall comply with their Constitution, peace and happiness will return.

THE RESOLUTIONS.

The following are the resolutions adopted at the meeting addressed by Mr. GLOVER.

1. *Resolved*, That we recognize in Abraham Lincoln an ardent patriot and a wise statesman; that, as President of the United States, respect and obedience are due to his authority; that we herewith announce our determination to sustain him in his efforts to put down the rebellion, and restore the supremacy of the Constitution and the authority of the Government; that, in the performance of this great task, we assert that he should have the sympathy and co-operation of every loyal citizen; that, as citizens of Missouri, our special gratitude is due to him for the zealous support he has given to the system of emancipation which has been

adopted by the State, and also for the ever prompt and efficient exercise of the armed power of the Government in our behalf; we affirm that the Constitutions of the United States and of Missouri are the highest laws for the government of our political action, and that in every emergency the Constitutional power of the Federal and State Governments is, and we pledge ourselves to sustain him in all measures calculated to preserve the loyalty of the State, and promote the tranquility and security of the people, sufficient for maintaining and perpetuating it in all its attributes; we also maintain that the welfare of Missouri demands that the laws of the State, while unrepealed, shall be enforced, and that it is the duty of all good citizens to aid and assist in the enforcement thereof, and to encourage and support the civil authorities therein.

2. *Resolved*, That while we earnestly desire the return to the people, at the earliest practical moment, of the right to choose their own rulers, we yet fully approve the action of the Convention in continuing the State Administration in power until the period of the next regular election, believing, while in many of the counties it is impossible to collect the revenue or to administer justice through the instrumentality of the courts, that any election of State officers would create dangerous excitement and involve unnecessary risk; and we further declare that we have full confidence in the loyalty, uprightness and patriotism of Governor Gamble.

3. *Resolved*, That proclaiming as we do our allegiance to the Constitution and the Government as the paramount obligation, we hold it to be our duty to denounce traitors at heart all who counsel resistance to the authority of the one, or disregard for the obligations of the other: the doctrine of nullification being the root from which secession and rebellion have sprung.

4. *Resolved*, That regarding slavery as an unqualified evil to our State and people, we cordially approve the policy of emancipation, and accept the Ordinance as the best settlement of the question attainable under the circumstances, and we shall look to the General Assembly for such additional action as shall be found necessary to give effect to the policy of freedom established by that great organic law.

5. *Resolved*, That the right of the Convention to adopt any measure calculated to wed Missouri more closely to the Union being unquestioned, and the institution of slavery constituting, as it did, a bond of sympathy between this State and the rebel States, the right of the Convention to decree its extinction in the State is so evident that none deny it, except slavery perpetuationists and the revolutionary faction, which would peril the cause of freedom in the hope of winning licentious power.

6. *Resolved*, That the coalition of slavery perpetuationists and certain professed Emancipationists formed in the Convention, and sought to be formed throughout the State, in opposition to the best measure of emancipation attainable, is the highest evidence of the insincerity of those who, in the name of freedom, seek only to promote their own factions and selfish schemes.

7. *Resolved*, That Missouri, having decreed the manumission of her slaves, without compensation from the General Government, or any other aid, she will also, if need be, rely solely on herself to take care of this class of her population by provident and humane legislation, but as this will tax her capacity and resources, and as each State (with or without the co-operation of the Federal Government) should bear the burdens and inconveniences incident to its transition from slavery to freedom, we protest against the deportation of the freed men of other States to Missouri as unjust to our whole laboring population, as deeply prejudicial to the interests of our own freed men, and as violative of our laws and Constitution.

8. *Resolved*, That the separation of the white and colored races is demanded by the best interests of both, and, perhaps, by the safety of the latter, which at least can only attain its fullest development and most suitable social and political organization when relieved from the ascendancy and overshadowing influence of the white race; and, therefore, we re-affirm our adhesion to the great measure proposed by Jefferson, and repeatedly recommended by President Lincoln, of assign-

ing to the negroes of this country a territory of their own and a form of government adapted to their capacity and acquirements

9. *Resolved*, That we are unalterably opposed to amalgamation, or the equality, intermarriage, or fusion of the white and black races—a policy boldly avowed and advocated by revolutionary abolition leaders here and elsewhere; that we are not less hostile to the measures calculated to lead to such a lamentable result, and hence that we will resist in every legitimate way the project of extending the elective franchise to negroes, or permitting them to share with the superior race in the government and legislation of the country.

10. *Resolved*, That the victories achieved by the national arms at Vicksburg, Gettysburg, Helena and Port Hudson afford cause for rejoicings and devout thanks to Almighty God from every loyal heart.

That the Great West having, by the indomitable valor of its troops, and the unrivaled sagacity of its Generals, driven off every enemy from the Mississippi, it has the right to ask from the Government that every effort shall be made to secure to our people, without delay, the uninterrupted commerce of that river; and the chairman of this meeting be instructed to communicate this resolution to the President of the United States by telegraph.



DOBBS BROS.
LIBRARY BINDING

FEB 71

ST. AUGUSTINE

FLA.

32084

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 898 455 9

